

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 159532  
ORIGIN IO-14

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 EA-07 ISO-00 SIL-01 LAB-04 SS-15  
SSO-00 CIAE-00 COME-00 EB-07 INR-07 NSAE-00 AF-10  
ARA-10 NEA-10 NSC-05 SP-02 PRS-01 L-03 NSCE-00  
INRE-00 /109 R

DRAFTED BY IO:CWMAYNES:

APPROVED BY P:PCHABIB

S/L:DGOOD

LABOR:DHOROWITZ

IO:GADALLEY

-----116326 090109Z /64

O 090032Z JUL 77

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION GENEVA IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION USUN NEW YORK IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BERN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY CANBERRA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY DUBLIN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LUXEMBOURG PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY OSLO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY OTTAWA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY ROME PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY STOCKHOLM PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY TOKYO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY VIENNA PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 159532

FOR SORENSON FROM MAYNES

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 159532

E.O. 11652:GDS

TAGS:PLAB, ILO

SUBJECT:U.S. POSITION ON THE ILO

REF: (A) GENEVA 5480; (B) STATE 145981

1. IN ANY FURTHER TALKS WITH OTHER DELEGATIONS ABOUT ILO, YOU SHOULD REFRAIN FROM VOLUNTEERING ASSESSMENTS OF SITUATION BUT FOLLOWING IS OUR CURRENT ASSESSMENT WHICH YOU MAY USE AS BACKGROUND.

A. WE OBVIOUSLY VERY DISAPPOINTED ABOUT JUNE 1977 CONFERENCE WHICH ROLLED BACK SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS MADE IN 18 MONTHS BEFORE AND DURING MARCH 1977 GOVERNING BODY MEETING. FROM YOUR REPORTS, HOWEVER, IT APPEARS MANY MISSIONS, WHICH DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THEIR DELEGATIONS' VIEWS OR VIEWS IN CAPITALS, HAVE MISUNDERSTOOD AND ARE DISTORTING U.S. POSITION AT CONFERENCE. WE ARE DISTURBED BY THIS BECAUSE WHETHER U.S. STAYS OR LEAVES ILO, IT ESSENTIAL FROM STANDPOINT OF UN SYSTEM AS WHOLE THAT WE NOT LOSE PROGRESS THAT HAS BEEN MADE IN LAST TWO YEARS IN DRAWING ATTENTION OF GROWING NUMBER OF COUNTRIES TO UNHEALTHY TRENDS. SOME MISSIONS APPEAR TO BE SAYING THAT 1) U.S. HAD TOTALLY INFLEXIBLE BOTTOM LINE POSITION -- "EITHER SUPPORT ALL KEY U.S. POSITIONS WITH A MAJORITY VOTE OR U.S. WILL GET OUT"

AND 2) SINCE POSITION SO CATEGORICAL, OUTCOME WAS INEVITABLE. IN FACT, U.S. STEADFASTLY RESISTED OVER TWO YEAR PERIOD EFFORTS BY OTHERS TO FORCE US TO DRAW SUCH AN INFLEXIBLE BOTTOM LINE. AS STATED IN OUR FINAL CIRCULAR  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 159532

TO ALL POSTS PRIOR TO JUNE 1977 CONFERENCE, "OUR PURPOSE IS NOT TO FORCE OUR VIEWS ON OTHERS BUT WITH THE BENEFIT OF THIS EXTRAORDINARY TWO-YEAR EFFORT AT CONSULTATION AND STUDY TO DETERMINE IF THERE REMAINS WITHIN THE ILO SUFFICIENT COMMUNITY OF INTEREST BETWEEN THE ILO AND OTHER MEMBERS OVER THE FUNDAMENTAL PURPOSES OF THE ILO." WE WERE NOT INSISTING ON VICTORY ACROSS THE BOARD BUT EVIDENCE OF CONTINUING MOMENTUM, SUSTAINED PROGRESS. WE WERE CONCERNED WITH PROGRESS IN CONCRETE FORM WHICH WOULD REFLECT MODIFICATION OF TRENDS ENUMERATED IN NOVEMBER 1977 LETTER.

B. AGAINST THIS STANDARD, THE HEARTENING ASPECT OF THE LAST TWO YEARS WAS CLEARLY THE AWAKENING OF THE INDUSTRIALIZED DEMOCRATIC COUNTRIES, WHICH COLLECTIVELY STOOD TOGETHER AS AT NO TIME IN THE YEARS IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING OUR LETTER OF INTENT TO WITHDRAW. WITH THIS GROUP OF COUNTRIES, THE LAST TWO YEARS CLEARLY ESTABLISHED THAT THERE IS "SUFFICIENT COMMUNITY OF INTEREST." A SENIOR AFL-CIO OFFICIAL, WHO FINDS CONFERENCE RESULTS UNACCEPTABLE, NEVERTHELESS REMARKS THAT IT WAS "NO MEAN ACHIEVEMENT" IN LIGHT OF THE PAST TO RALLY 135 VOTES FOR POSITIONS OF CRITICAL INTEREST TO AFL-CIO AND USG.

C. THE GREAT DISAPPOINTMENT AT THE JUNE CONFERENCE WAS THE RESPONSE OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, MANY OF WHICH HAD ASSURED US IN HIGH-LEVEL CONVERSATIONS IN CAPITALS THAT THEY WOULD WORK WITH THE US FOR A FAVORABLE RESOLUTION OF SOME OR ALL OF THE KEY ISSUES COMING BEFORE THE CONFERENCE. WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SOME -- CAMEROON, HONDURAS, COLOMBIA, FIJI, NEPAL, PAPUA NEW GUINEA, JAMAICA, KENYA, SWAZILAND, SURINAM -- THIRD WORLD DELEGATIONS EITHER AVOIDED THE ISSUE BY ABSENTING THEMSELVES FROM THE DELEGATION HALL OR BY JOINING THE COMMUNIST AND ARAB COUNTRIES IN ABSTAINING, A PROCEDURAL DEVICE DESIGNED TO DEFEAT KEY ISSUES OF INTEREST TO THE US. SOME OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES WHICH OPPOSED US IN JUNE 1977 IN AN  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 159532

OPEN BALLOT HAD IN FACT SUPPORTED US IN MARCH 1977 ON SOME ISSUES UNDER THE SECRET BALLOT RULE OF THE GOVERNING BODY.

D. CLEARLY THE RECORD OF THE JUNE CONFERENCE WILL BE A CENTRAL FACTOR IN FINAL US DECISION. HAD THE CONFERENCE BEEN SUCCESSFUL, GIVEN THE POSITIVE RECORD OF THE PAST TWO YEARS, THERE WOULD BE A CLEAR EXPECTATION THAT US

WOULD REMAIN IN THE ILO. BUT THE CONFERENCE, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE STRONG SHOWING BY THE WESTERN INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES, TURNED OUT NEGATIVELY AND THE US IS CURRENTLY REVIEWING ITS OVERALL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE ILO, INCLUDING THE COMPLETE RECORD OF LAST TWO YEARS.

E. REGARDING SOME IMEC (INDUSTRIALIZED MARKET ECONOMY COUNTRIES) MISSION REPRESENTATIVES REPORTED "STATE OF SHOCK: AND MOUNTING FEARS THAT SOVIETS AND G-77 WILL NOW DOMINATE ILO FOR ANTI-WESTERN PURPOSES, THIS WILL DEPEND MORE ON POLICIES IMEC NOW DECIDE TO ADOPT THAN ON WHETHER US IN OR OUT. IF THERE IS AN IMEC RETREAT TO PASSIVE ATTITUDES PRIOR TO LAST TWO YEARS, THEN MOST EXTREME IMEC FEARS WILL BE REALIZED. BUT IF IMEC CONTINUE TO RECOGNIZE IN PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND PRIVATE ACTIONS THEIR COLLECTIVE INTEREST IN INSISTING THAT OTHER ILO MEMBERS ADHERE TO CERTAIN PRINCIPLES, THERE IS LESS REASON TO LOSE HEART. AFTER ALL, WITH OR WITHOUT US, IMEC COUNTRIES COLLECTIVELY CAN EXERT ENORMOUS INFLUENCE IN ILO. WITHOUT US THEY CONTRIBUTE APPROXIMATELY 40 PERCENT OF BUDGET. THEY CONTROL 6 OF 10 PERMANENT SEATS. THEY HAVE COLLECTIVE ABILITY TO VETO CHANGES IN ILO CONSTITUTION.

F. IN SHORT, IF IMEC COUNTRIES NOW MOVE BEYOND POLICY OF  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 159532

MERELY VOTING TOGETHER TO POLICY OF COORDINATED LOBBYING IN CAPITALS THERE IS NO REASON WHY SMALL CORE OF SUPPORT WITHIN THIRD WORLD CANNOT INCREASE IN SIZE. THIS POSSIBILITY OF INCREASING THIRD WORLD SUPPORT ASSUMES GREATER PROPORTIONS WHEN IT IS REALIZED THAT THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES CAN NO LONGER COUNT ON WHAT THEY PERCEIVED AS A STANDOFF BETWEEN THE USSR AND THE US TO FACILITATE ACHIEVEMENT OF THEIR OBJECTIVES IN THE ORGANIZATION. THIS COORDINATED LOBBYING IS IN IMEC INTERESTS REGARDLESS OF WHETHER US REMAINS A MEMBER. PRIOR TO JUNE 1977 CONFERENCE, ONLY US WAS WILLING TO MAKE ILO ISSUES MATTERS OF ITS BILATERAL DIPLOMACY. LESSON OF JUNE 1977 SHOULD NOT BE THAT WEST CANNOT WIN BUT THAT ONE COUNTRY -- THE US -- WORKING ALONE CAN DO A GREAT DEAL BUT NOT ENOUGH. TOGETHER, HOWEVER, THE IMEC COUNTRIES COULD MAKE A DIFFERENCE. WHETHER THE IMEC COUNTRIES NOW COALESCE AND WORK TOGETHER WILL, IN FACT, DETERMINE WHETHER ILO REMAINS AN INSTITUTION IN THE FUTURE THAT DEMOCRATIC STATES WISH TO REMAIN IN, OR ASSOCIATE WITH.

G. THERE ARE, AS THE MISSION UNDERSCORES, DIFFERENT VALUE SYSTEMS AT WORK IN THE ILO. THESE ARE DIFFICULT TO RECONCILE. BUT THIS IS A PROBLEM THE IMEC COUNTRIES FACE IN EVERY INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTION. ELSEWHERE THEY HAVE FOUND THAT COALITIONS THAT SEEM MONOLITHIC OR BEYOND

INFLUENCE CAN CHANGE IN LEADERSHIP OR DIRECTION. WITH OR WITHOUT THE US, THIS CAN HAPPEN IN THE ILO. THIS DOES NOT REQUIRE CONFRONTATION WITH THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES BUT ENGAGED COORDINATED DIPLOMACY, SOMETHING THUS FAR LACKING. IN THIS REGARD, WHATEVER FINAL US DECISION, ITS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ILO IN FUTURE WILL NECESSARILY REFLECT WHAT IT SEES. CONSEQUENTLY, IT IS CRITICAL NOT TO RETURN TO PRE-1975 POLICIES.

2. WHEN APPROPRIATE, YOU MAY POINT OUT TO IMEC DELEGATIONS  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 159532

THAT US DELEGATE HOROWITZ PROMISED THAT US WOULD CONSULT WITH IMEC BEFORE ANNOUNCEMENT OF US DECISION. VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** MEMBERSHIP, POLICIES, INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATIONS, MEETING REPORTS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Sent Date:** 09-Jul-1977 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Date:** 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 22 May 2009  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1977STATE159532  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** CWMAYNES:  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D770244-0023  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1977/newtext/t19770774/aaaacmqqa.tel  
**Line Count:** 219  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 4f46f96d-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ORIGIN IO  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 77 GENEVA 5480, 77 STATE 145981  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 22-Dec-2004 12:00:00 am  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 1913122  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** U.S. POSITION ON THE ILO  
**TAGS:** ELAB, US, ILO  
**To:** GENEVA  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/4f46f96d-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
22 May 2009  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009